

III. REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 10-12 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Final Office Action, claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being dependent upon cancelled claim 2. By this Amendment, claims 10-12 have been revised to resolve this condition. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-3 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,259), hereafter “Kikinis,” in view of Markus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601), hereinafter “Markus”; and claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kikinis and Markus, and further in view of Bhatia et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0154162), hereafter “Bhatia.” Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is allowable for the reasons stated below.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants submit that the suggested combination of the cited references does not disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, “calling (701) the program component

in order to store (703) the modified information data in the buffer memory [and] calling (705) the program component in order to separately upload (709) to the network server the modified information data.” (Claim 1). Applicants submit that Kikinis and Markus do not disclose or suggest this feature, as discussed in the previous response of 10/1/07. In the Final Office Action, the Office asserts that “Kikinis clearly discloses a user perusing a form for accuracy, to which corrections can be made prior to uploading the completed HTML form to its destination (i.e., a server) via an independently applied “Send Form” button. (Final Office Action at page 7, similarly in page 4). Applicants submit that this assertion is not relevant to the above features because the above features claim separately uploading the modified information data other than the information data retrieved from the buffer or downloaded from the network server that already exist in the a form-based format hypertext document. However, as indicated in the Office’s assertion above, Kikinis only discloses uploading the completed HTML form which includes both the already existing data and the modification together. The independent applied “Send Form” button of Kikinis also bears no relation to the above claimed feature as the application of the “Send Form” button uploads the complete form not the modified information data separately. Applicants submit that whether application of a button is independent is irrelevant here because the claims claim uploading modified information data separately than existing information data (i.e., either retrieved from the buffer or downloaded from network server). In addition, Kikinis also does not teach that a modification of information data by the user through a user interface is performed independently of the retrieval of the modified information data, as Kikinis does not disclose retrieving modified information data.

The Office also asserts that various buffers for holding data were known as the time of the

invention. (final Office Action at page 7.) However, Kikinis does not disclose or suggest uploading modified information data separately no matter whether various buffers are used. Applicants submit that storing data in buffers is not equivalent to uploading modified information data separately than data existing in the the form-based format hypertext document.

The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons stated above, as well as for their own additional features. Applicants submit that Bhatia does not overcome the deficiencies of Kikinis and Markus. In view of the foregoing, the Office fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jianping Zhang/

Date: 2/27/2008

Jianping Zhang
Reg. No.: L0414

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)